



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*A TURNING POINT IN SYNOPTIC CRITICISM*

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

Christianity as not only a world-religion, but pre-eminently *the* world-religion, can be rationally appreciated only in the light of its origins. The nineteenth century, therefore, to which nothing was understood that had not been understood genetically, devoted its newly won methods of historical criticism to a comparison of the contemporary documents, the Pauline Epistles, with Acts, the earliest embodiment of the tradition, that it might learn the facts of the great evolution of the Church from the Synagogue. But inquiry into the story of the second founder of our faith was, from the nature of the case, a mere preliminary to the deeper inquiry into the story of its first Founder.

Here also the elements of the problem were providentially presented in the same two categories of subjective and objective. Acts and Epistles had as their counterparts, blended together in the Synoptic Gospels, a traditional story of Jesus' career and a report of his sayings. For the latter had been so reverently guarded as almost to take the place of a contemporary document beside the tradition of his career.

Critical comparison was as imperative in the case of Jesus as in that of Paul. But if in the remoter problem the prize was loftier, the obstacles were also greater and the path more intricate.

Textual criticism having given the Synoptic Evangelists' work in the nearest attainable approach to its authentic form, it became the primary task of the higher criticism to extricate the ultimate sources, freeing them, as far as possible, from reciprocal, as well as from external, admixture. With the completion of this task would begin the final process of historical criticism, in the intrinsic valuation of these ultimate sources and the reconstruction from them of a history as complete, self-consistent, and rationally conceivable as the available data would permit. Such, in general

tendency, though not always with clear prescience of the issue, has been the course of criticism for a hundred years past. The source-criticism of the first third of the nineteenth century was chiefly a war of independence from the domination of churchly tradition, desultory, and largely negative in its results. It issued in the great attempt of Baur and Strauss to strike their trial balance in a critical history of Christian origins. The verdict was recom-mittal of the problem. Another half-century of patient, toilsome analysis of the documents intervened. The turning point, so far as the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels is concerned, almost exactly coincides with the beginning of the twentieth century. The year 1899 witnessed the appearance in Germany of Wernle's *Synoptisches Problem*, in England of Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*, concentrating in purely scientific, classified form the phenomena of these, the fundamental documents of evangelic tradition. The year 1901 begins, on the other hand, a series of brilliant attempts at critical valuation and interpretation of these sources. Wrede's *Messiasgeheimnis* is recognized as marking "the epoch of 1901" by critics as diverse in point of view as Schweitzer<sup>1</sup> and Jülicher;<sup>2</sup> while the entrance into the field of such authorities in Old Testament criticism as Wellhausen<sup>3</sup> and such Church historians as Harnack<sup>4</sup> indicates that it is "white already to the harvest."

Meantime a practical consensus has been reached on the authenticity of the greater Pauline Epistles, and on the date and the relatively unhistorical character of the Fourth Gospel. No wonder the pendulum of criticism begins to swing again from the analytical to the constructive side. The Synoptic problem, many tell us, has been solved, at least to the extent that it admits of solution. It is time to scrutinize results and to draw the ultimate inferences. Schweitzer is ready for the task, and to trace the

<sup>1</sup> Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung, Tübingen, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> Neue Linien in der Kritik der evangelischen Ueberlieferung, Giessen, 1906.

<sup>3</sup> Das Evangelium Marci, 1903; Matthaei, 1904; Lucae, 1904; Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 1905.

<sup>4</sup> Lukas der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte, 1906; Sprüche und Reden Jesu: die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas, 1907.

history of the study of the life of Jesus from Reimarus to Wrede, finding that it issues, through the "consistent scepticism" of Wrede, in his own "consistent eschatological theory." Scholars of a less impressionist type, with somewhat larger claim to speak as representatives of the half-century of patient analysis, H. J. Holtzmann, whose *Synoptische Evangelien* (1863) laid the foundation of the now-accepted two-document theory, and Jülicher, whose *Introduction to the New Testament*<sup>5</sup> ranks next to Holtzmann's as the representative liberal survey of the results of documentary criticism, have given us a very emphatically different answer.<sup>6</sup>

It seems thus to be possible, from practically identical results in the field of documentary criticism, to draw inferences varying all the way from the portraiture of Jesus as an obscure messianistic agitator, of whom we know practically nothing save that he preached a fanatical apocalyptic eschatology with himself as central figure, and was disappointed by the disastrous event, to a conception of him as the real, though not altogether conscious, founder of the new world-religion, a historical figure whose teaching may be definitely known in its substance, and, in outline, even his career and personality. Under such circumstances, the framing of an independent view of the real outcome of this common basis of admitted results in the analysis of the Synoptic sources, and the drawing of independent inferences as to their significance, are for every man of intelligence matters of necessity rather than of mere inclination.

The veteran Holtzmann may well be pardoned if he views with some satisfaction the present attitude of leading scholars toward the two propositions in behalf of which he entered the lists nearly a half-century ago. Weisse<sup>7</sup> and Wilke<sup>8</sup> had then but

<sup>5</sup> English translation, from the second German edition, 1904.

<sup>6</sup> See H. J. Holtzmann, "Die Marcus-Kontroverse in ihrer heutigen Gestalt," in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, X (1907), pp. 18-40 and 161-200; further, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Leben-Jesu-Forschung," in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, XXVII (1906), col. 2357-2364, 2413-2422, 2477-2483, 2541-2546.

<sup>7</sup> *Die evangelische Geschichte, kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 1838.

<sup>8</sup> *Der Urevangelist, oder exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien*, 1838.

recently broken from the prevailing Tübingen theory of Mark as a conciliatory combination of Matthew and Luke, asserting the dependence of these two upon Mark. Weisse applied the contention of Lachmann regarding the Marcan order to Matthew, showing it to be a combination of the narrative of Mark with a mass of discourse material which he identified with the Logia attributed by Papias to the Apostle. Wilke declared that a systematic, scholarly, and dispassionate application of recognized principles of literary criticism, in place of the premature and undisciplined theorizing indulged in by the Tübingen school on the one side and by Ewald on the other, could establish the facts by documentary proof. In coincidence with Weisse, he predicted as the outcome a recognition of Mark as the true *Grund-schrift* of Synoptic tradition. Holtzmann's championship of the theory was of the type that Wilke would have chosen; not by eloquence or imagination, but by systematic application of rigidly scientific method. Thus he formulated in definite terms the second proposition which, together with the Mark-theory of Lachmann, constitutes the basis of the now dominant two-document theory: the coincident material of Matthew and Luke not derived from Mark, which is principally of the nature of discourse, can be accounted for neither by a relation of direct dependence between the two nor by independent use of oral tradition, but is drawn from "a second source common to Matthew and Luke, but employed by the two in completely different ways."<sup>9</sup>

A half-century of controversy, of aberration, of experiment with every form of hypothesis, of relentless insistence upon every feature of the problem wherein the two-document theory admittedly falls short of a complete explanation of the facts, ends with the declaration from Wellhausen<sup>10</sup> in Germany, re-echoed by Burkitt<sup>11</sup> in England, that the one decisive, unalterable certainty achieved in the long conflict is "that Mark furnished the framework for Matthew and Luke"; and that to Lachmann, in 1835, belongs the credit of the essential element in the demonstration, namely, the invariable failure of either Evangelist to

<sup>9</sup> Die synoptischen Evangelien, p. 126.

<sup>10</sup> Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, p. 43.

<sup>11</sup> The Gospel History and its Transmission, 1906, p. 37.

support the other in any divergence from the order of Mark. Holtzmann himself, surveying in 1907 the whole field of scholarly opinion, is able to descry but two remaining irreconcilables. Hilgenfeld, of Jena, still defended a remnant of the old Tübingen theory in his doctrine of the priority of Matthew,<sup>12</sup> though even this is not our Matthew, but a precanonical form of that gospel; and Merx, the learned critic of the Sinaitic Syriac text, finds evidence in some peculiar readings of that ancient, but not uniformly trustworthy, version for a similar conclusion. With these exceptions, the world of New Testament scholars is unanimous<sup>13</sup> in acceptance of the first great result of the two-document theory, namely, that Mark is the *Grundschrift* of the Synoptic tradition. The fact is not merely that this Gospel contains the narrative content of the evangelic material, but that this particular composition in something very near its present Greek form, with its present disposition and order of material, has been made the basis, and practically the only narrative basis, by each of the other Synoptists for his Gospel. Mere inspection of the general contents of the Synoptic Gospels shows that there was but one such narrative used in common by these writers. The proof in detail that this common story was the story of our Gospel of Mark is of immense significance, once the character and history of this writing are understood.

Since the still lingering opposition to the Mark-theory all centres upon Matthew, or at least a proto-Matthew, there is a special timeliness in the recent systematic analysis of W. C. Allen,<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See his *Markus-Evangelium*, 1850; his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875; and a continuous series of articles and reviews in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, especially against Holtzmann (1902, pp. 144-146); M. Schultze and Wrede (1903, pp. 4-19); Wellhausen (1904, pp. 182-228, 239-332, 462-524); and R. A. Hoffmann (1905, pp. 309-311).

<sup>13</sup> Zahn, "the prince of conservative scholars," in his commentary, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 1903, refers the reader to his *Einleitung*, II, § 57, for the question of the relation of Matthew to Mark." His answer is, Mark is not dependent on our Matthew, but on the Aramaic original Matthew, which in content and order was identical with ours. Badham's *St. Mark's Indebtedness to St. Matthew*, 1897, is mentioned by Holtzmann, but not as having independent significance.

<sup>14</sup> Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew (*International Critical Commentary*), 1907.

where the statistics of Hawkins and Wernle are applied to the specific question of Mark as the principal source of Matthew with a cumulative force that is irresistible. As a result, the proto-Matthew which might have been the basis of Mark appears in its real intangibility; a ghost flitting from the light toward the limbo of the "inerrant original text."

But as regards the complementary pillar of the two-document theory, Allen himself is one of the unconverted. Other theories than that of a single principal common source seem to him to be required to account for the non-Markan element of discourse material common to Matthew and Luke, if not for their numerous minute coincident variations in their Marcan material. He will not "force the oral tradition theory to cover all the facts presented by the agreement of Matthew and Luke, because there is reason to think that both writers used written sources." How can he, when their agreement in this material is to a notable degree closer than in the material borrowed from Mark? Oral tradition, when carried to this degree of stereotyped invariability, becomes indistinguishable in practical application from a document. Allen inclines rather to "a view at present very much out of favor among critical writers," the theory that "S. Luke was acquainted with the first Gospel." Holtzmann himself, in earlier days,<sup>15</sup> was not unwilling to concede to E. Simons<sup>16</sup> reminiscences of Matthew, to account for minor elements of the coincident non-Markan material. But the great reciprocal omissions and unreconciled contradictions, which must be admitted to exist on any theory of real literary dependence, compelled its limitation to the vague form of a mental echo; the third Evangelist might have heard the reading of Matthew at the Lord's day service and carried away impressions which unconsciously reproduced themselves in his own composition.

There has been progress since 1892. We owe much to Wernle and Hawkins for their strict application of scientific method to the identification of the synoptic *Grundschrift*; with what decisive results we have already seen. But Wernle has rendered a greater service still in the laying of this second ghost of a literary relation

<sup>15</sup> Einleitung, 3 ed., 1892, p. 356 f.

<sup>16</sup> Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt? 1880.

between Matthew and Luke. The systematic working through of pages 40-80 of Wernle's *Synoptische Frage*, as every student of the Synoptic problem should work it through, is not the task of a few spare half-hours; but the result will fully explain why the view that Luke was acquainted with Matthew is "at present very much out of favor among critical writers." Wernle expresses it thus: "Comparison of Luke with Matthew in regard to content, sequence, and text (verbal form), gives as result that Matthew cannot be among the sources of Luke. Luke has no acquaintance with a part of the Matthæan narratives; he never follows their sequence; and nowhere in his text (verbal form), whether in the Marcan narrative or the discourses, has he been affected by Matthew. The discourses which he has in common with Matthew he did not take from Matthew, but, coincidentally with him, from a collection of discourses lost to us. Although not strictly demonstrable, it is nevertheless probable that Matthew was entirely unknown to Luke."

The theory of a partial and reminiscent employment of Matthew by Luke is indeed difficult to reconcile with the systematic method professed by the latter (Luke 1 1-4). How is it conceivable that a writer of this type should be aware of the existence of this recent and most comprehensive, if not already most popular and most authoritative, of all works in the line of his own labors, and should remain so indifferent to its contributions?

Subordinating the still unsettled questions of detail, such as the numerous minute coincident variations of Matthew and Luke from Mark in their Marcan material, and the failure of repeated attempts to reconstruct a self-consistent composition from the non-Markan remainder, we may set it down as a second result of the last half-century of documentary criticism, a result whose general acceptance lingers but slightly behind that of the Mark-theory, that it has confirmed and definitely established the twin pillar of the Holtzmann-Weisse two-document theory in the certainty that our "Matthew was not among the sources of Luke," nor conversely. The inference is unavoidable and conclusive that "the discourses which he has in common with Matthew . . . are taken coincidentally with him from a collection of discourses lost to us."

It is imperative that these great and definitely established results of pure documentary analysis be differentiated from, and considered in proper perspective with, that remainder of subordinate phenomena whose significance is still in debate. This remainder may require us to qualify our description of either or both the two main factors of Synoptic tradition. We may be compelled to recognize modifications in the form of Mark extending beyond even such notable textual phenomena as the suppression of its original ending. The concession may conceivably reach a point justifying in some degree the once popular theory of a proto-Mark. Further research must be carried on. Ewald's theory of diegeses may be defunct, but its demise has not done away with the fact that such groups of anecdotes were actually known to Luke (Luke 11), nor with the sure evidences still apparent in the text of Mark of the use of such pre-existing agglutinated material, some of it certainly related to that of the other source. All this will not annul the first great achievement: Mark is the narrative basis of our Gospels.

No less important are the modifications sure to come in the theory of the "teaching" source. The indications are very strong that we shall be compelled to recede from the tempting identification of it with the reported Logia of the Apostle Matthew. This identification was indeed a sally beyond the domain of strict source-analysis. We must substitute the more strictly algebraic symbol  $Q$  (*Quelle*)<sup>17</sup> of Wellhausen and Harnack for the question-begging  $\Delta$  (*Δόγια*) of Holtzmann's *Synoptische Evangelien* and the older school. In our attempts at reconstruction, the simple formula of Wendt,<sup>18</sup> namely, superimpose Matthew and Luke and subtract Mark, will no longer serve. Resch<sup>19</sup> did not improve the condition of the "heap of interesting ruins," which, as he rightly said, had been left by his predecessor, by sifting the soil of the second and third century for possible traces of Logian

<sup>17</sup> In the German the symbol is not strictly algebraic; it assumes a single document. In English it may be used to designate the strictly definable entity, the non-Markan common element of Matthew and Luke whencesoever derived. See Salmon, *Human Element in the Gospels*, 1907, p. 24.

<sup>18</sup> *Die Lehre Jesu*, I, 1886. This analytical portion of the work was omitted from the English translation.

<sup>19</sup> *Die Logia Jesu*, 1898.

gold. The value of his results is negative. They show how little else but Q there was. Harnack paves the way for really systematic reconstruction;<sup>20</sup> but his main result is to show how completely, in its substance, the work confined itself to the teaching of Jesus, not even relating the story of his passion and resurrection. His effort to explain how such a work could begin with a formal introduction of the *dramatis personae*, recounting the Baptist's preaching of repentance and the baptism of Jesus, and including the significant story of the centurion's faith, is conspicuously unsuccessful. How could the principal actor be brought thus formally to the centre of the stage, and then simply left standing there? Even to Wernle the difficulty was not new. Holtzmann<sup>21</sup> had sought to meet the scruples of Weisse on this score by connecting the preaching of John with the discourse of Jesus on the Baptist, as forming together an opening sermon on the beginning of the gospel. Wernle<sup>22</sup> went further, and frankly distinguished the narrative introduction and the story of the centurion of Capernaum as the additions of a later hand. But few will consider that a solution of the problem has yet been reached. We have still to determine the nature and order of the grouping of material in Q, the leading ideas of its compiler, his purpose, standpoint, and method; and until this is done the vital question of its relation to Mark can hardly be answered. On the one side there doubtless lurks a fallacy of method in the process of eliminating from consideration as possible elements of Q all material also found in Mark. Take for example the story of the barren fig-tree. Matthew has preferred to give it to us in the narrative version of Mark; must we then conclude that Luke drew his parable version of it from some other source than that which he elsewhere shares with Matthew? Or, take an instance where the primary dependence of both Matthew and Luke is on Mark. Both thus relate the transfiguration, though with some striking coincident variations. But in Mark itself 9 2-10 is a doublet, as regards doctrinal content, of 8 27-9 1 11-13, and it has close intrinsic affinities in both thought and language

<sup>20</sup> *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 1907.

<sup>21</sup> *Synoptische Evangelien*, p. 142.

<sup>22</sup> *Synoptische Frage*, p. 226.

with the story of Jesus' baptism and temptation. Must we disregard these because the Marcan form was more acceptable to Matthew and Luke? The contention of the elder<sup>23</sup> and younger<sup>24</sup> Weiss for a larger narrative content of Q, and a dependence of all three Evangelists on it, is not so easily met, when this weak point of method and the unsolved problem of the coincident variations of Matthew and Luke are fairly considered. Moreover, Wellhausen has introduced an almost startling novelty into the field of debate by his emphatic declaration in favor of the priority of Mark to Q; and Wernle already concedes that we must distinguish between Sayings (*Sprüche*) and Discourses (*Reden*),<sup>25</sup> and that the agglutinated discourses of Q give just as much evidence of their secondary and artificial composition as the artificially connected narratives of Mark.

The third Gospel, with its second treatise, Acts, is also brought again into the field. Harnack's *Luke the Physician*<sup>26</sup> renews the argument of Hobart's *Medical Language of St. Luke* to prove linguistically the traditional authorship, though, as an ally of Ramsay,<sup>27</sup> he will hardly be welcome for his valuation of Luke as a historian.

Thus the problems that still remain to be solved by the patient, dispassionate methods of literary analysis are as full of interest and as burning as ever. But from these it is possible—and not only possible but imperative—to distinguish the achieved results,<sup>28</sup> and to bring them into comparison with the ancient tradition of gospel origins.

<sup>23</sup> B. Weiss, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1872; *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 9 ed., 1901; *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Markusevangeliums*, 1905.

<sup>24</sup> J. Weiss, *Das "lteste Evangelium*, 1903; *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, 2 ed., 1907.

<sup>25</sup> *Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, 1906, p. 71.

<sup>26</sup> English translation by Wilkinson, 1907.

<sup>27</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895.

<sup>28</sup> Wernle, *Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, 1906, p. 35, formulates these results as follows:

1. The short Gospel is the source of the two longer.
2. Besides it, the two long Gospels are based in common on a Greek discourse-source.
3. Finally, Matthew and Luke have each their share of peculiar tradition.

The most striking result of such comparison is the correspondence of the two in broad outline. It is true that the Gospel of Mark does not seem to us to be so lacking in order as the other Gospels, for it alone supplies what outline still remains of historical perspective in the story of Jesus; a beginning, in the great Sabbath of preaching and mighty works at Capernaum after the imprisonment of John, where Peter's house is headquarters; a middle, in the declaration of the messianic programme at Cæsarea Philippi, where Peter's confession is the nucleus; an end, in the tragedy in Jerusalem, where Peter's denial and restoration form the pivot—or would, if the original ending of the Gospel had not been suppressed. And yet it becomes more and more conspicuously clear, even to such conservative critics as the elder Weiss,<sup>29</sup> that the ancient description of Mark's order as not a historical or chronological sequence, but a sequence adapted to the requirements of practical edification, is justified to the letter. Even the great pivotal points are not appreciated as such by the Evangelist. The "beginning of miracles" at Capernaum, with the following vigil of prayer by Jesus, has scarcely to him its historical significance. The confession of Peter is to him anything but epoch-making. The story of the women at the tomb has (at least in subsequent development) eclipsed the all-important "turning again" of Peter. Notoriously, his subordinate groups are topical and not chronological, the geography inconceivable,<sup>30</sup> and the relation of events almost regardless of before and after.<sup>31</sup> All that is certain is that somewhere, very far behind this agglomeration of anecdotes, there looms up dimly the figure of the Galilean fisherman as ultimate narrator, and that Mark, like Paul, reverts to "what Peter could relate"<sup>32</sup> when the evangelic story is in question. And documentary criticism adds the abundant, decisive evidence that in the days even of Matthew and Luke there was already practically nothing else but Mark to represent the story of Jesus. For some remarkable reason all else had been eclipsed.

It is also true that Q is very far from meeting Papias's descrip-

<sup>29</sup> B. Weiss, *Geschichtlichkeit des Markusevangeliums*, 1905.

<sup>30</sup> Mark 5 1 14 20 6 45 53 7 31, etc.

<sup>31</sup> Mark 3 6 22 7 1 8 34 9 14.

<sup>32</sup> ἀνῆλθον ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν, Gal. 1 18; cf. 1 Cor. 15 1-5, ὡφθῇ Κηφᾶ.

tion of the Matthæan Logia. It was not Semitic in language, but Greek. Even if apostolic in origin, it certainly was not primitive; and even if its text be often more authentically reflected in Matthew than in Luke, it is not Matthew, the Palestinian gospel which from its origin, circulation, and authorship should be expected to correspond most nearly with the Logia, that actually stands nearest in order, arrangement, and spirit to Q. No; our first evangelist shows decided preference for the Marcan disposition, contents, and language, wherever choice was open. It is our third gospel, traditionally of Antiochian derivation,<sup>33</sup> which reverses this preference, and shows closer spiritual affinity with Q, although always freer than Matthew in verbal transcription. Again, there is little *prima facie* agreement between the tradition and the results of criticism. But deep down there is much. Q, as we know it, is a Greek composition, more Pauline in theology than Petrine, closer in affinity to Luke than to Matthew, secondary in its elaboration of the sayings into discourses. But there remain embedded in it some few decisive evidences of translation from a Semitic original;<sup>34</sup> its conception of the evangelic message is, in distinction from Paul's, the teaching rather than the personality and career of Jesus; and, finally and most significantly, it includes practically all. Matthew's few parables not shared by Luke are not enough to alter the force of this far-reaching general phenomenon. His antitheses of the higher righteousness (Matt. 5 21-42) and other material bearing on the special issue with Mosaism can hardly be counted as derived from some other source, because Luke's systematic omission of kindred material in Mark (for example, Mark 7 1-23 10 1-10 12 28-34) makes it practically certain that he would have omitted this from Q.

The second fact revealed to us by documentary analysis, namely,

<sup>33</sup> The tradition of the Antiochian parentage of Luke, reported by Eusebius (HE. iii, 4, 7), finds strong support, if applied not to the man but to the writings, in the phenomena of Acts, some of which are lightly touched upon by Harnack (Lukas der Arzt, p. 15; cf. Bacon, "Acts versus Galatians," in American Journal of Theology, July, 1907), and in the singular choice of this gospel by Marcion, disciple of Cerdo of Antioch.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. Matt. 24 51 = Luke 12 46; cf. Isa. 53 12, "divide him his portion with the great."

that there was, when our first and third Gospels were compiled, practically but one great source besides Mark; that this source comprised the teaching of Jesus in the form of elaborated discourses—and probably very little else—with strong indications of a remoter period when the sayings circulated unagglutinated into discourses and in a Semitic tongue, is a phenomenon to be placed alongside that of the Petrine narrative in our attempt to interpret the ancient tradition in the light of critical results. Why does all the available material fall into these two groups, Roman narrative and Syrian teaching? Why does the comparison of our two later gospels of the things which Jesus “began both to do and to teach” with their two sources, Mark and Q, give a result so analogous to that obtained by comparison of the extra-canonical with the canonical, a sense of the relative poverty and worthlessness of all they were able to add? Only the explanation which applies to the extra-canonical gospels will meet the case: Mark and Q had exhausted the field. In their respective regions, Rome, headquarters of the Gentile mission field, Pauline in its whole constitution and by the very necessity of the case, however it might cling to the name of Peter, and Syria, with its two great seats of Christianity, Jerusalem and Antioch, had between them taken up the whole available substance of evangelic tradition. Jerusalem gloried in the apostolic tradition of the teaching “compiled by Matthew in the Hebrew tongue.” Antioch (if we may be allowed an inference from Gal. 2 11-13) combined, as Rome did, the names of Peter and Paul, though reversing the proportionate influence of each on real doctrinal attitude. Here something more of Petrine narrative was added to Matthæan teaching before the combination with Mark; while even Jerusalem, in substituting Greek for Aramaic, was content to adopt also the more literary Antiochian (?) recast of its Logia.

The lesson of the comparison between tradition and sources is that both have a long history behind them. Neither Mark nor Q is a primitive composition, but the distinction in their type is primitive. It is not only witnessed to by the ancient tradition, with its echoes of rivalry between the home-made apostolic and the Roman gospel, but it reflects the most vital distinction between the gospel of Paul and that of those who were apostles

before him. To "the apostles and elders in Jerusalem" the teaching was its essence. To Paul, the story, the drama of the self-humiliated, divinely exalted Son of God, had been, since he himself first learned it from the lips of Peter, the objective background of his message of the Christ manifested in him as the Son of God by the resurrection.

"The elder" of Papias is our witness how long the teaching of Jesus was preserved independently of the story of his life, death, and resurrection. Only at a comparatively late period in the history of evangelic composition did it become the practice to combine "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach."<sup>35</sup> Tradition tells first of a body of "sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ,"<sup>36</sup> as the norm of doctrine. Later we hear of a compilation of "the oracles of the Lord" by the Apostle Matthew "in the Hebrew tongue." True, our informant, Papias, as well as his contemporary Polycarp, who uses the same term, "oracles of the Lord," as his standard,<sup>37</sup> may employ it in the comprehensive sense in which his contemporaries apply it to the general teaching of the Old Testament;<sup>38</sup> or, indeed, the term may be simply a Greek rendering of the title *Dibre Yeshua*, which might mean either "Sayings of Jesus" or "Matters Concerning Jesus." So far, then, as this part of the tradition reported by Papias is concerned, there is little to indicate the nature of the apostolic document referred to. We can only say that Papias himself, who gave to his own work the title, "Expositions of the Lord's Oracles," was in search of "the commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith," and that this represents the need which would be first felt in the Aramaic-speaking churches. But besides the anonymous tradition which Papias reports concerning Matthew, he gives another regarding Mark, this latter explicitly from "the elder," and the two seem to stand in an antithetic relation. Matthew's commandments of the Lord<sup>39</sup> is the admitted standard by comparison with which Mark is judged and defended. The description of Mark as containing "both the things said and the things done"<sup>40</sup> by the Lord, may therefore fairly be brought into

<sup>35</sup> Acts 1 1.      <sup>36</sup> 1 Tim. 6 3.      <sup>37</sup> Ep. Polyc. 7 1.      <sup>38</sup> E.g. 1 Clem. 62 3.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Matt. 28 20 with Papias, ἐντολὰς . . . παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας.

<sup>40</sup> ἡ λεχθέντα ἡ πραχθέντα.

comparison with the simpler phrase regarding Matthew. The significant point of agreement between source-analysis and ancient tradition is that both lead us back to that remote past when the Church knew but two fundamental types of gospel composition. To the one of these might be applied the terms "teaching," "commandments," "sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," "oracles of the Lord"; to the other, "sayings and doings," "doings and teachings." Or it might be more fully described as the "report concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil . . . whom also they slew, hanging him on a tree, but God raised him up the third day."<sup>41</sup> For the missionary of the Pauline school, making converts among the Gentiles, the latter diegesis would be the outline of the gospel. To judge from the Pauline epistles, it would require but very slight supplementation from the commandments of the Lord. The Pauline object was a committal of the life to Jesus as the living heavenly Lord, in order to become animated by his spirit of filial devotion to the divine will. For this purpose, knowledge of Jesus' teaching as a scribe of the kingdom in the interpretation of that will in detail was wholly subordinate. Hearers or readers must be convinced of his real Lordship as glorified Redeemer, and made acquainted from the story of his career with the quality of "the mind which was in Christ Jesus." By way of commandment, the law of love, superseding all others, would suffice.<sup>42</sup> For the representative of the Aramaic-speaking church the vital element of the tradition lay necessarily elsewhere. To him Christianity was simply the flower of Judaism; Jesus was the second Moses,<sup>43</sup> the prophet raised up from among his brethren to give the ideal and authoritative interpretation of the law, who after securing the obedience of a repentant people to this higher law would reappear from heaven as the Christ.<sup>44</sup> In the churches of Syria, accordingly, or at least of Palestine, the all-important element was the teaching. The condition of entrance into life was to keep the commandments. Were the question asked, Which?

<sup>41</sup> Acts 10 37-40.

<sup>42</sup> Rom. 13 8-10; Gal. 5 14 6 15; Mark 12 28-34.

<sup>43</sup> So uniformly in the Ebionite Clementine writings.

<sup>44</sup> Acts 3 18-26.

the answer was, Those of the decalogue, as supplemented and interpreted by Jesus' law of love.<sup>45</sup>

The deepest cleavage of the evangelic tradition, both in the character of the documents as they come down to us and in the most ancient testimony of the Church, is precisely along this line of the subjective and objective view. The second and fourth Gospels are fundamentally Pauline, because the starting point in their line of development is to convey the knowledge of Christ as the ascended Lord, and the fellowship of his sufferings and the power of his resurrection. Mark's is the Paulinism of a layman, stripped of the theological element; John's, the Paulinism of the theologian, interested in Paul's christology rather than in the practical issues. Both centre upon the doctrine of the spirit of adoption, incarnate and victorious in Jesus. They are written that men "may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and by believing may have life in his name."<sup>46</sup> That which the other two Gospels add to this has a different character and a different motive. The contrast is obscured by the later tendency to combine, harmonize, assimilate; but the common remainder obtained after the subtraction of Mark appears in the Lucan, and still more strongly in the Matthæan, form as the product of the Jewish Christian rather than the Gentile or Pauline conception of the essence of the gospel. It centres upon the doctrine of the heavenly reward. It seems almost to presuppose faith in Christ, rather than aim to produce it; and this faith is of value only as it prepares the soul to accept and do the commandment. The essential content of the evangelic tradition is conceived as "the Way," "the Teaching"; and its content corresponds.

In sketching the great results of documentary criticism we have to some extent unavoidably anticipated those of that historical criticism whose advent seems to be impending. As a first attempt to sum up results, Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* is a great and epoch-marking book. "Consistent scepticism" is his inference from the establishment of the Mark-theory. Weisse, its founder, was far from sharing the complacent optimism

<sup>45</sup> Matt. 19 17-19; contrast the parallel in Mark.

<sup>46</sup> John 20 31; cf. Mark 1 1 11 9 7 15 39.

of a school of followers who accommodate it to traditional views by the easy logic, "first, therefore primitive and authentic." Contrariwise, Bruno Bauer<sup>47</sup> represents the logical outcome. The wholly secondary, unhistorical character of the Fourth Gospel once admitted, and Mark recognized as the basis of Matthew and Luke if not of Q as well, internal analysis of Mark leads inevitably, in his judgment, to a verdict differing only in degree from that pronounced against John. Brandt<sup>48</sup> and Wrede<sup>49</sup> mark the logical steps along this road, negatively establishing through the inconsistencies of the narrator the untrustworthiness of his story, and positively accounting for its distinctive features by coincidences of adaptation to a later-constructed ecclesiastical theory of the origin of the doctrine of the messiahship. To Schweitzer the determination of the other factor of evangelic tradition, the teaching of Jesus, as a parallel phenomenon, brings only the confirmation of the eschatological theory of Johannes Weiss,<sup>50</sup> and makes it, in spite of Paul, the supreme interest of Jesus to proclaim himself the Son of Man in the crudely apocalyptic sense.

It is to be regretted that a volume so truly great in its knowledge and appreciation of the bearing of the work of critics should show so little first-hand acquaintance with the ultimate sources which by common acknowledgment must now be recognized as the documentary basis for the critical history of Jesus. Schweitzer<sup>51</sup> thinks Matt. 19 12 good enough evidence to disprove von Soden's characterization of the teaching of Jesus as wholesome, just as if the admitted distinction between Q and the redactional additions to Matthew had never been drawn. Over and over he reverts to the inappropriate conclusion of the instructions to the apostles, Matt. 10 16-42, just as if there were no reasons but the arbitrary choice of the critics for distinguishing the Marcan

<sup>47</sup> *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker, 1841-1842; Kritik der Evangelien, 1850-1852.*

<sup>48</sup> *Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christenthums, 1893.*

<sup>49</sup> *Das Messiasgeheimnis, 1901.*

<sup>50</sup> *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, 2 ed., 1900.* See also *Das älteste Evangelium, 1903.*

<sup>51</sup> *Von Reimarus zu Wrede, p. 306, n. 1.*

nucleus forming the substance of 10 1-15 from the Matthæan agglutinated supplement in verses 16-42. Schweitzer has no more apprehension of the history, substance, and significance of Q, in distinction from later amplifications, than he thinks his opponents have of the fact that the canonical Gospels are the products of their age. Equally so as respects Mark. Over and over Mark 4 11-12 must serve to fasten upon Jesus himself, or at least our ultimate knowledge of him, the artificial, *ex post facto* theory that the preaching in parables was an intentional hiding of the light. He not only can see no contrast between these two interjected verses and the adjoining material which they so badly misinterpret, but is afflicted with the blindness of those who will not see toward the connection of this Marcan theory with the Pauline apologetic of Rom. 9-11. No wonder it strikes Holtzmann as little less than cool effrontery when Schweitzer replies to this explanation of Mark 4 10 ff., "It really is about time to point out these Pauline influences on Mark, instead of constantly asserting them. How would Mark look if it had got into the hands of a Paulinist?"<sup>52</sup> Schweitzer's work marks an epoch, because it issues so well the summons to another trial balance on the work of the documentary critics, and itself responds to it so badly.

In its results, particularly in the field of Synoptic criticism, the old trial balance of the Tübingen school has been rejected once for all. The essence of Baur's method, however, remains established with equal permanence and definiteness: First, the Gospels are ecclesiastical formulations of the tradition, and must be interpreted as the products of their time. Second, the issues of that time must be defined by independent scrutiny of the great Pauline Epistles. Comparison of the results of documentary analysis with the ancient account of gospel origins yields, indeed, some negative results, which simply go to show that the tradition is more ancient than the canonical Gospels to which Papias and later investigators vainly seek to apply it; but these are outweighed by the great positive result that we are carried back to a period which knows but two streams of evangelic tradition, attaching respectively to the names of Matthew and Peter. For in the

<sup>52</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 303; cf. Holtzmann, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, X, 37-40.

ultimate comparison, geographical distribution, internal characteristics, and ancient tradition will be found at one in connecting this Syrian-Roman division of the evangelic tradition with the transition of the gospel from Semitic to Aryan soil; from particularism to universalism; from a centre of gravity with James and "the apostles and elders" at Jerusalem<sup>53</sup> to a centre of gravity at Rome with an idealized Peter and Paul.

The school of criticism that has already struck out the true lines of valuation for the evangelic tradition, unknown to Schweitzer, we may designate the aetiological,<sup>54</sup> from its recognition that the starting point is the existing belief or practice of the Church, which is to be explained or justified by means of the tradition of its origin. In Mark we have a stringing together of groups of anecdotes from the story of Jesus, illustrative of (1) baptism and the gifts of the Spirit. So Jesus was baptized and endowed. (2) The ministry in its two functions of teaching and healing. So the apostles received "the mystery of the kingdom," and witnessed the wonder-working of faith. (3) The *agapé*, and its symbolism of the bread of life. So Jesus fed the multitudes and predicted his death for the world. (4) The institution of the Church. So Jesus and the Twelve went forth leaving all. (5) The eucharist, with its lesson of death and resurrection. The general arrangement is dominated by a conspicuously Pauline motive. Of course we do not expect to find in Mark the Pauline mysticism. That was reserved for the Fourth Gospel. Our Evangelist is a Paulinist of the type of those who in Corinth appealed to the Apostle for advice which should confirm their own radicalism, and got instead a rebuke of their disposition to rate the gifts of miracles above the inward gifts of the Spirit; of their inconsiderate use of the principle "all things are lawful," without regard for the weak brother; of their war-cry, "I am of Paul," against the equal intolerance of those who claimed special authority for Peter. To

<sup>53</sup> Acts 21 18; Gal. 2 1-10.

<sup>54</sup> The term is applied by Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, p. 15, with rather inadequate application of the principle. Wrede's *Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901, in its positive contributions, which greatly outweigh the negative, marks the new development in this direction. Note the citations from Jülicher, Wernle, Pfeiderer, B. and J. Weiss, Harnack, Bousset, Frommel, and Zimmermann, made by Holtzmann, l. c., pp. 26-28, as typical of the aetiological tendency.

the Roman evangelist, Peter is a witness, as he had been to Paul (Gal. 1 18; 1 Cor. 15 1-5); with James and John he has the reward of the "witness" faithful unto death (Mark 10 28-31 35-45). But that reward is not to "exercise authority over" the Church (10 42-44). For the rest, Mark knows scarcely more of Peter than the sharp rebukes he received (8 33 9 5-6), his conspicuous disloyalty (14 29-31 66-72), and the self-seeking (10 28) and incapacity to receive the truth which he had shared with all "the disciples" (6 52 7 18 9 28 32). Of James and John he has just one anecdote besides that of their request for the places of honor (10 35-45). It is Jesus' rebuke of their narrow intolerance (9 38-41).<sup>55</sup> Of the brethren of the Lord he has also one, "They went out to lay hold on him, for they said, He is beside himself." Of Peter's share in the "turning again" and "stablishing his brethren," to which the Apostle owed his best title to the name of Rock-Foundation of the Church, as Mark related the story, we can only judge by the fact that that portion of the Gospel in which it appeared has been suppressed by the Church, while the allusion to this rallying of the scattered flock in 14 28 makes Jesus personally, and not Peter, the agent.

There is a Petrine element in Mark, but it lies very far back indeed, and shows itself in spite of the Evangelist rather than by his intention. It is not the Petrinism of Luke, whose solution of the whole problem of "distinctions of meats" and "the pollutions of idols" is the mediating position of Peter so sharply rebuked by Paul in Galatians 2 11-16,<sup>56</sup> and who makes Peter the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 15 7). Mark 7 1-23 solves this whole question by a radical repudiation of Judaism as a "vain worship," "commandments of men" (cf. Col. 2 22), invoking the principle, "there is nothing which goeth into a man that can defile him," as "making all meats clean" (7 19). On the subject of the law, he supersedes Mosaism by clear enunciation of the principle of the higher law of God in creation (10 1-9). Goodness is not

<sup>55</sup> The omission of this passage by Matthew should be studied in the light of Matt. 7 21-23, which inverts the sub-Pauline principle that acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord and exercise of the gifts of the Spirit is proof of discipleship.

<sup>56</sup> See Bacon, "Acts versus Galatians: the Crux of Apostolic History," in *American Journal of Theology*, XI (1907), pp. 454-474.

won by keeping the commandments, but by the utter self-renunciation of Jesus (10 17-22). Its law is not that of "whole burnt-offering and sacrifice," but the love of God and man (12 28-34).<sup>57</sup> But we are not endeavoring to prove the Paulinism of Mark, which is amply sustained by the critics to whom Holtzmann directs Schweitzer's attention;<sup>58</sup> we are merely pointing to the beginnings of a historico-critical school which finds the key to the formulation of gospel material in the aetiological motive. And the first result of its application is to find that the great epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians lay bare to us the institutions, the problems, the live issues which the groups of anecdotes in Mark are adapted to explain, determine, and justify. The issues of Mark are the real and practical problems of Gentile church life between 70 and 90 A.D.

Historico-critical interpretation and valuation of Q is, from the nature of the case, far less advanced; but the work of reconstruction, as it appears, e.g., in Harnack's *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, permits already a similar application of the aetiological method. Here, too, we have agglutination of the sayings into discourses, whose principle of aggregation is again practical ecclesiastical use, but with the Jewish Christian conception of the Gospel as a "royal law," a glorified *Torah*, as the motive. What was the interaction of the two factors in the accumulation and transmission of the evangelic tradition; whether Q was known to Mark or conversely, or whether only factors of each were reciprocally known—these are questions still in the hands of the documentary critics.<sup>59</sup> The established fact is the process, which went on in the Aramaic-speaking church, from the time of the Apostle Matthew to that of our own Greek Gospel of Matthew, under the same dominant idea of "teaching to observe all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded." The principle was, "If thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments," viz.,

<sup>57</sup> In all cases the parallels in Matthew and Luke must be compared. In nearly every case of Pauline radicalism in Mark it will be found that Luke omits the passage, while Matthew inverts its sense by verbal changes.

<sup>58</sup> See the authorities cited in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, X, pp. 38-40.

<sup>59</sup> On the influence of Q or some factor of it on Mark 1 1-13, see Bacon, "The Prologue of Mark," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXVI (1907), pp. 84-106.

those of Moses as interpreted and supplemented by Jesus.<sup>60</sup> The true exponent was the "scribe of the kingdom," who, with the Twelve, had learned to "bring forth from his treasure the new and the old"; the false exponent, he who propagated "lawlessness" under cover of confession of the Lordship and exercise of the charismata.<sup>61</sup> How long the process continued before the ultimate combination of the Palestinian type with the Roman appears not merely from such internal evidence as Matt. 7 22 13 41 16 18-19 22 6-7 28 19, and similar references, but from the completeness with which the Roman gospel had monopolized the field of narrative, even in Syria, when our Matthew began his harmonistic work. Moreover, it is not Jerusalem, but Antioch, which supplied him the form and principal contents of even the Oriental factor. Even this now survives not as an Aramaic, but a Greek teaching of Jesus; not as an anti-Pauline, but a catholic form of the tradition; not as a Gospel according to the Hebrews, with James as the dominant figure, but in the group of apostolic "scribes of the kingdom of heaven" (13 51-52), the chief scribe, entrusted with the keys and the authority to bind and loose, is Peter. Our first and third Gospels present a parallel phenomenon at a period which their mutual independence compels us to regard as almost the same. It is the phenomenon of the adjustment of the apostolic gospel of the teaching to the Pauline gospel of the personality. Antioch is the centre; and the name to conjure with is that of Peter, with the Apostles and Matthew in the dim background.

The vista of research which opens before the twentieth century gives a long perspective, whether in the field of documentary analysis or historical interpretation. But the elements of the problem, and the method, are more surely in hand than ever; and the results are far from indicating the negative conclusions Schweitzer would have us believe. We can bring into relation the documents and the ancient tradition, interpreting both in the light of the great Pauline Epistles. Ultimately we shall make the teaching of Jesus and the story about him interpret each other.

<sup>60</sup> Matt. 23 30 19 17-19.

<sup>61</sup> Matt. 5 17-20 7 22-23 13 39-41 24 11-12.